



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/997,960	11/29/2001	Bhupesh Gupta	AUS920011025US1	4916

7590 08/24/2005
Volel Emile
P.O. Box 202170
Austin, TX 78720-2170

EXAMINER

BASEHOAR, ADAM L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2178

DATE MAILED: 08/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/997,960

Applicant(s)

GUPTA, BHUPESH

Examiner

Adam L. Basehoar

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the communications: The Amendment filed 06/02/05 to the original Application filed 11/19/01.
2. The rejection of Claims 1 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 101 have been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.
3. Claims 1-24 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft FrontPage, 12/31/99, Screen Shots pp. 1-7 in view of Khan (US-6,546,393 04/08/03).
4. Claim 25 has been added.
5. Claims 1-25 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 7, 13, 19, and 25 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft FrontPage, 12/31/99, Screen Shots pp. 1-7 in view of Khan (US-6,546,393 04/08/03).

-In regard to independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, FrontPage claims a method, apparatus, and a computer program product for web management comprising:

creating a copy of links to files (pp. 3: "Copy") stored in a first sub-folder (pp. 2: "Sub-Folder 1" stores link to file "new_page_2.htm) and storing (pp. 4: "Paste") the copy

of links to files in a second sub-folder (pp. 5: "Sub-Folder 2" stores copied files in Sub-Folder 1). FrontPage does not specifically teach wherein the links to files were bookmarks. Kahn teaches a bookmark management system wherein bookmarks were also known as links or shortcuts (column 14, lines 44-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for the links to files in FrontPage to have been considered bookmarks, because Kahn teaches that bookmarks were notoriously well known in the art to include the above mentioned links or shortcuts to files (column 14, lines 44-48).

-In regard to dependent claims 2, 8, 14, and 20, FrontPage teaches marking said copy as having been originated from said first sub-folder (pp. 6: i.e. copy of "new_page_2.htm" was shown to have originated from said first sub-folder by residing within "Sub-Folder 1").

-In regard to dependent claims 3, 9, 15, and 21, FrontPage teaches when the second sub-folder was accessed (pp. 6) the bookmarks originally stored therein (pp. 6: "reqdtoc.htm" and "status.htm") and the copy (pp.6: "new_page_2.htm") are displayed in a distinguishing manner (i.e. Separated by the "Sub-Folder 1" Heading).

-In regard to dependent claims 4, 10, 16, and 22, FrontPage teaches wherein the distinguishing manner includes displaying the copy under a title (pp. 6: copy of "new_page_2.htm" displayed under the title "Sub-Folder 1").

Art Unit: 2178

-In regard to dependent claims 5, 11, 17, and 23, FrontPage teaches wherein the title was the name of the first sub-folder (pp.6: Title Name is "Sub-Folder 1").

-In regard to dependent claims 6, 12, 18, and 24, FrontPage teaches wherein the distinguishing manner includes being able to highlight the copy (pp. 7: "new_page_2.htm" is highlighted).

8. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft FrontPage, 12/31/99, Screen Shots pp. 1-7 in view of Khan (US-6,546,393 04/08/03) in further view of Web Definition, "highlight", 09/01/96, pp. 1-2, <http://www.webopedia.com/TERM/H/highlight.html>.

-In regard to independent claim 25, FrontPage teaches a computer implemented method of linking a first sub-folder to a second sub-folder in a bookmark folder comprising the steps of:

copying (pp. 3: "Copy") all bookmarks (pp. 2: "new_page_2.htm") stored in the first sub-folder (pp. 2: "Sub-Folder 1") into the second sub-folder (pp. 4: "Paste"); and

assembling all the bookmarks (pp. 5: "reqtoc.htm" & "status.htm") originally stored in the second sub-folder (pp. 5: "Sub-Folder 2") into a first group (i.e. grouped outside the copied Sub-Folder1 grouping) and the bookmarks (pp. 6: "new_page_2.htm") copied into the second sub-folder into a second group (pp. 6: grouped inside the "Sub-Folder1" heading) in the second sub-folder (pp. 6: "Sub-Folder2").

FrontPage does not specifically teach wherein the links to files were bookmarks. Kahn teaches a bookmark management system wherein bookmarks were also known as links or shortcuts (column 14, lines 44-48). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for the links to files in FrontPage to have been considered bookmarks, because Kahn teaches that bookmarks were notoriously well known in the art to include the above mentioned links or shortcuts to files (column 14, lines 44-48).

FrontPage teaches when the second sub-folder was opened being able to display bookmarks in the first group (i.e. grouped outside the copied Sub-Folder1 grouping) (pp. 6: "reqtoc.htm" & "status.htm") and bookmarks in the second group highlighted (pp. 7: grouped inside the "Sub-Folder1" heading). FrontPage does not specifically teach highlighting the first group instead of the second group and only displaying bookmarks when opening the second sub-folder (i.e. it additionally shows a folder heading to group the copied bookmarks). Web Definition teaches that it was notoriously well known at the time of the invention to highlight any selected blocks of text to provided the benefit of making said text object stand out by displaying it in a different mode from other objects (Definition: "Highlight"). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention for FrontPage to have highlighted the links of the first group instead of the second group as well as only show bookmarks, because Web Definition taught that the highlighting of different objects was notoriously well known in the art at the time of the invention to provide the benefit of visually differentiating objects, which would have allowed FrontPage to visually show which bookmark links were original to second sub-folder and which were copied into the second sub-folder from the first sub-folder without the need of showing the folder heading containing the second group.

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 06/02/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

-In regard to substantially similar independent claims 1, 7, 13, and 19, Applicant argues that Microsoft FrontPage does not teach copying the content of a first sub-folder into a second sub-folder (Remarks: Page 15). The Examiner agrees that (pp. 3) shows copying a first sub-folder containing a link to a web page (pp. 2: "new_page_2.htm": i.e. a bookmark) and copying it into a second sub-folder (pp. 4). However the Examiner believes that Microsoft FrontPage clearly teaches wherein the content of the first sub-folder (pp. 2: "new_page_2.htm") was copied in addition to the actual first sub-folder and stored in the second sub-folder (pp. 6: Sub-Folder 2 now contains a copy of new_page_2.htm). Thus when the second sub-folder (pp. 6: "Sub-Folder 2") was accessed the original content of the second sub-folder (pp. 6: "reqdtoc.htm" & "status.htm"), the first sub-folder (pp. 6: "Sub-Folder 1"), and the content of the first sub-folder (pp. 6: "new_page_2.htm") would be displayed (pp. 6-7). As claimed, the limitations of the independent claims do not preclude the Microsoft FrontPage method of creating a copy of bookmarks in a first sub-folder in a second sub-folder by creating a copy of the first sub-folder and storing it within the second sub-folder. In general the Examiner feels the limitations of the independent claims are broadly recited and should be further limited in an attempt to overcome the applied prior art of record.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US-2005/0108418	05-2005	Bedi et al.
US-6,493,702	12-2002	Adar et al.
US-5,917,491	06-1999	Bauersfeld, Kristin

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Adam L. Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

Art Unit: 2178

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB



STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER